

## **REMARKS**

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

### **I. Amendments to the Claims**

Claims 6 and 7 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

Further, claims 1, 8 and 25-27 have been amended. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 25-27 have been amended to incorporate features similar to those recited in dependent claims 6 and 7, which are now cancelled. Also, claim 8 has been amended to depend from claim 1, rather than cancelled claim 7.

### **II. 35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection**

Claims 1, 3, 6-8 and 16-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for failure to recite statutory subject matter, for reciting limitations that can be interpreted as software alone.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the specifying information memory includes a physical memory, which now requires more than software alone. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 3, 8 and 16-24 that depend therefrom now recite statutory subject matter.

Claim 25 is directed to an integrated circuit, which requires physical hardware and requires more than software alone. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that this 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection is not applicable to claim 25.

In view of the above, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

### **III. Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 7 and 8 were identified by the Examiner as being allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of base claim 1 and any intervening claims.

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter.

As mentioned above, independent claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of intervening claim 6 and claim 7, which was identified by the Examiner as containing allowable subject matter.

Furthermore, as mentioned above, independent claims 25, 26 and 27 have been amended to include the subject matter of intervening claim 6 and claim 7, which was identified by the Examiner as containing allowable subject matter.

Accordingly, in view of the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter as discussed above, it is submitted that amended independent claims 1, 25, 26 and 27 and claims 3, 8 and 16-25 that depend therefrom are allowable.

### **IV. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections**

Claims 1, 3, 6, 16-18 and 20-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Nakamura (U.S. 7,424,204) and Sull (U.S. 7,548,565).

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Nakamura, Sull and Wilf (U.S. 7,184,100).

In view of the above-mentioned amendments and the indication of allowable subject matter, these rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to independent claims 1, 25, 26 and 27 and claims 3, 8 and 16-25 that depend therefrom. As a result, withdrawal of these 35 U.S.C. §103 rejections is respectfully requested.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kentaro TANIKAWA et al.

**/Andrew L. Dunlap/**

By 2011.02.08 12:10:10 -05'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap

Registration No. 60,554

Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led  
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
February 8, 2011